

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/602,495	06/23/2003	Darrell James Shelton	M5015.P001	2225
7590 11/16/2004			EXAMINER	
Mark S. Peloquin			HUYNH, KHOA D	
PELOQUIN, P	LLC		ADTIBUT	D. DED 144 CDED
Suite 4100		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
800 Fifth Avenue			3751	
Scattle, WA 98104-3100			DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/602,495	SHELTON, DARRELL JAMES			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Khoa D. Huynh	3751			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE : - External after - If the - If NC - Failur Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLIMALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing adapted term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.					
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 45-47 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicati	on Papers	•				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application in the second	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
3) 🛭 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/03 & 11/25/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 45-47, in the reply filed on 10/29/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a prima facie case for restricting the claims has not been made. This is not found persuasive because
- a) inventions II and I are related as method and apparatus for its practice. And, in this instant the method as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus such as an apparatus that does not require both a seat portion and a back portion (see cited references), and
- b) inventions II and I include divergent claimed subject matter that separate the inventions. And such recognized divergent subject matter is a burden to examination.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Furthermore, claims 1-44 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn the non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation "inspecting an area of...a lower spine region...by accessing the human through an aperture in the support surface" renders the claim

Application/Control Number: 10/602,495 Page 3

Art Unit: 3751

indefinite since it is unclear how a person is capable of inspecting the lower spine region himself/herself while positioned on the support surface. Furthermore, it is unclear what the meaning of "by accessing the human through an aperture in the support surface" is.

Claim 47 depends on claim 46 and is likewise indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 45-47, as presently understood and given the broadest reasonable interpretations, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilk (5551098).

Regarding claim 45, the Wilk reference discloses a device (Fig. 5) that cleans an anal region of a person. The device includes a support surface (at 42) supporting the person, and an aperture (about 68 in Figure 5) that allows the accessing of the anal region to clean it.

Regarding claim 46, the Wilk reference discloses a device (Fig. 5) that allows a person to medically treat him or herself with afflictions such as hemorrhoids and cystitis. The device includes a support surface (at 42) supporting a person, and an aperture (about 68 in Figure 5) that allows the accessing of the anal region to clean it and, inherently, the visual inspection of

Application/Control Number: 10/602,495 Page 4

Art Unit: 3751

the anal region during the cleaning and after the cleaning to make sure that the anal region is indeed cleaned.

Regarding claim 47, as stated above, the Wilk device is known to be used to treat afflictions such as hemorrhoids and cystitis, thus, when the device is used, medical services are inherently administering to the person, in the forms of cleansing, douching, irrigating using disinfectant agents (col. 2, lines 60-65), through the aperture in the support surface.

6. Claim 45, as presently understood and given the broadest reasonable interpretations, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (5201080).

The Tanaka et al. reference discloses a device (Fig. 1) that cleans an anal region of a person. The device includes a support surface (at 2) supporting the person, and an aperture (the opening formed in element 2) that allows the accessing of the anal region to clean it.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 46 and 47, as presently understood and given the broadest reasonable interpretations, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (5201080) in view of Tsipov (5513396).

The Tanaka et al. reference discloses a device (Fig. 1) that allows a person to medically treat him or herself with afflictions such as hemorrhoids and cystitis (col. 5, lines 52-60). The device includes a support surface (at 2) supporting a person, and an aperture (the opening formed in element 2) that allows the accessing of the anal region to clean it.

The Tanaka et al. reference DIFFERS in that it does not specifically include the inspection of an area of the person as claimed. Attention, however, is directed to the Tsipov reference which discloses device (10) that allows a person using a toilet or a bidet (a device that is used to medically treat a person with afflictions such as hemorrhoids and cystitis) to monitor or inspect the lower parts of his or her body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Tanaka et al device by employing a device that is used to inspect the anal region of a person, in view of teaching of Tsipov, in order to allow the person to visually inspecting the cleaning action while sitting on the support surface.

Regarding claim 47, as stated above, the modified Tanaka et al. device is known to be used to treat afflictions such as hemorrhoids and cystitis, thus, when the device is used, medical services are inherently administering to the person, in the forms of cleansing, douching, irrigating using disinfectant agents (col. 5, lines 52-60), through the aperture in the support surface.

Art Unit: 3751

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Anderson et al. and Jamison were cited to show a sitz bath including a support surface with an aperture that allows a person to be medically treating in the anal region.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khoa D. Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 306-5483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (703) 308-2580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Khoa D. Huynh Patent Examiner Art Unit 3751

Chould

HK 11/12/04